DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 265 EC 200 785

AUTHOR Shimabukuro, Sandra; Lai, Morris
TITLE Evaluation of the Honolulu District Instructional Assistance Component for School Year 1984-85. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. Curriculum Research and Development Group.
SPONS AGENCY Hawaii State Dept. of Education, Honolulu.
PUB DATE Oct 85
NOTE 94p.; For a related document, see EC 200 784. Some pages contain light, broken type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; Elementary Education; Group Dynamics; Individual Instruction; Individualized Instruction; Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Materials; *Learning Disabilities; Mainstreaming; *Special Education; Special Education Teachers; Teacher Aides; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the Honolulu (Hawaii) District Instructional Assistance and Assessment Component involved the assignment of part-time teachers to six specific learning disabilities classrooms in elementary schools to work with the special education teacher in instructional and mainstreaming activities. Five other classrooms were used as comparisons. Classroom observations found that one-to-one instruction occurred more frequently in project schools. Parents saw one-to-one instruction as desirable and credited such close attention as the reason their child enjoyed and/or preferred the special class. Mainstreaming could prove difficult if children expect individual attention in regular classrooms. Some parents were concerned about the movement of their child between classes and missing work in the regular classroom. Group interaction between teacher and students or among students themselves was infrequently observed, limiting the richness of shared experiences. Seatwork was a common activity, perhaps a consequence of the individualized education program. Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) were administered to both project and comparison school students. Students in comparison schools scored higher on both the pretest and posttest in all batteries (Reading, Mathematics, Language, and Basic Total) than students in project schools, but project school students showed greater gains between tests. Recommendations are given for implementation during the expanded second year of the project. (Author/VW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED289265

Evaluation of the Honolulu District Instructional Assistance Component for School Year 1984-85

Final Report

Sandra Shimabukuro, M.P.H.
Morris Lai, Ph.D.

Curriculum Research and Development Group
College of Education
University of Hawai'i

October 1985

IEC 200 785

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sandra Shimabukuro
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Contents

Introduction 1

Project Description 1

Evaluation Method 2

Results 4

Literature Review on Time and Learning 26

Discussion 28

Summary and Recommendations 31

References 34

Appendix A: Evaluation Instruments 36

Appendix B: Report Forms Used by Project School Teachers 56

Executive Summary

The Honolulu District Office of the Department of Education contracted the Curriculum Research and Development Group (CRDG) of the University of Hawai'i to conduct an evaluation of the Instructional Assistance and Assessment Component (IAC), a special project of selected specific learning disabilities classrooms.

The project involved six project and five comparison classrooms at the elementary level. A part-time teacher was assigned to each of the project schools to work with the special education teacher in instructional and mainstreaming activities.

The part-time teacher was being utilized to assist in instruction as the project intended. Classroom observations indicated that teachers were most often observed checking children's work and monitoring their progress. One-to-one instruction occurred more frequently in project schools (29 percent of the observation time) than in comparison schools (10 percent of the observation time). The mean engagement rate of students in project schools was 77 percent compared to that of 69 percent by comparison school students. These data suggest the value of the part-time teacher in providing direct instruction and keeping students on task.

One-to-one instruction was seen as desirable by parents who, however, were aware that such interaction could not occur as frequently in their child's regular classroom. Close attention to students by the special education teacher was perceived by several parents as the reason their child enjoyed and sometimes even preferred the special class. Two parents described the "caring nature" of their child's special education teacher. Mainstreaming students is a critical issue here if children in special classes come to expect individual attention which is less likely to occur in their regular classroom.

Several parents also commented on the movement of their child between classes. They were concerned about their child missing work being given in the regular classroom. They wondered if regular education teachers knew what their child was learning in special education. Nearly all parents were told their child was progressing.

Group interaction between teacher and students or among students themselves was infrequently observed. Seatwork was a common activity, and may possibly be a consequence of the individualized education program. Children were often assigned work individually, and the richness of shared experiences and group interactions was limited. Children appeared anxious to make contact with their peers in other ways resulting in distractions and other behavioral

disruptions. When discussions or other teacher-directed group work did occur, students freely participated in these activities and, data indicated that there was a slightly higher task engagement rate during these periods than with seatwork assignments.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) were administered to both project and comparison school students. Scaled scores were selected for evaluation based on the MAT Teacher's Manual (1978) recommendations to use scaled scores for comparing performance among battery levels (that is, students are administered different levels of the test, and scores need to be equated) and for measuring change in achievement over a period of time.

Students in comparison schools scored higher on both the pretest and posttest in all batteries (Reading, Mathematics, Language, and Basic Total) than students in project schools. Although their scaled scores remained below those of comparison schools, project school students showed greater gain between pretest and posttest scores. That is, the mean difference between test scores was greater for project school students than for comparison school students. A covariance analysis was run to control difference in pretest scores between school groups. The adjusted mean posttest scores of project schools students were higher in mathematics, reading, and the basic battery than those of comparison school students. Differences in scores, however, were not statistically different.

An expansion of the project is already underway for the school year 1985-86. The following recommendations are based on the evaluation findings.

1. Identify common project goals and strategies for the part-time teacher and special education teacher team.

2. Reevaluate appropriateness of instructional material particularly seatwork materials for each child.

3. Provide inservice training which promote teaching behaviors found to be effective with special needs students.

4. Reassess techniques used to monitor progress of the children.

5. Reassess the demands of individualizing instruction to the extent it requires extensive record keeping and selection of learning tasks, at the expense of project teachers interactions.

6. Inform all faculty, staff, and parents of special education children about the project.

7. Continue evaluation through year-two of the project.

INTRODUCTION

The memorandum of agreement dated January 15, 1985 between the Hawai'i State Department of Education and the Curriculum Research and Development Group (CRDG) of the College of Education of the University of Hawai'i outlined the following objectives of the evaluation of the Instructional Assistance Component:

(a) to determine the component's effectiveness, both programatically and in terms of cost-effectiveness (in particular, the present pupil/teacher ratio will be reviewed and the part-time teachers positions will be studied),

(b) to assess/determine strengths/weaknesses of the current mainstreaming program, and

(c) to assess/determine strengths/weaknesses of the Instructional Assistance Component.

This report describes the methods and results of the evaluation. A description of the project is presented first. The literature review and discussion follow the results, and the final section summarizes the evaluation and presents the recommendations.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Honolulu District Office, Special Education, funded six part-time teacher positions for the school year 1984-85. These part-time teachers were assigned to work with the special education teachers at six elementary project schools selected by the District Office -- Kalihi-Uka, Kapalama, Lanakila, Liholiho, Lunalilo, and 'Aina Haina. Six elementary comparison schools which operated without part-time assistance were also chosen to participate in the evaluation -- Jefferson, Ke'ahumanu, Kalihi-Kai, Kamiloiki, Likelike, and Lincoln. These schools were selected by the District Office based on their population similarities to the project schools. At the request of the District Office, Jefferson was later dropped from the evaluation component because of difficulties in arranging for the evaluation team to work with the school.

The responsibilities of the part-time teacher were described in a Department of Education project description:

(a) Provide small group instruction in basic skills.

(b) Assist in the integration of students into regular education.

(c) Assist in the needs assessment.

EVALUATION METHOD

The evaluation of the Instructional Assistance Component was conducted using Guba and Lincoln's "responsive" model. This method stresses flexibility, adaptability, and the collection of naturalistic data. The general organizers of this type of evaluation are audience concerns and issues.

Classroom observations are important to the evaluation approach. Interviews provide an opportunity for participants to express their concerns. Comprehensive, reliable, and quantifiable data are collected by using adaptations of methods developed by Rist (1975), Ward and Tikunoff (1978), and Moos (1979).

This first year the Instructional Assistance Component started with a small number of classes. Project schools were hand-selected based on criteria such as willingness to participate in the project and representativeness of the student population. The nature of the project did not allow for randomization or matched sampling. Means and frequencies are presented, but the reader is cautioned that the sample includes only six project schools and five comparison schools. Likewise parent responses accounted for only a third of all parents receiving questionnaires, and of that percent one-third were interviewed. The evaluation, however, studied many of the issues confronting special education and received input from key players on the project. Despite its limitations, the evaluation is the only comparative study in the State on the assistance of part-time teachers in the special education program. The data provide valuable information for the project's administrators as well as policy makers in general.

Observations

The six project and five comparison school classrooms were observed for data collection purposes. In addition to student and teacher protocols (field notes), systematic data were collected using adaptations of observation instruments developed by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (1983). Information was recorded on subject matter focus, group setting, degree of teacher-student contact, student engagement, and teacher use of active teaching behaviors. The data collection instruments are included in Appendix A.

Observations were conducted by experienced data collectors who had been trained to use the procedures. The team had conducted similar observations for other evaluation projects of CRDG. Arrangements for the visitations were made ahead of time with the principal and teacher of each school.

Project school classrooms were observed on two occasions, and comparison school classrooms were visited once. All observations were done in the morning and spanned a period of one and a half to two hours. The two visits to project schools were conducted on different days of the week.

At each visit four students, generally two girls and two boys, were randomly selected for class observations. Time sampling procedures were used in which each of the students was observed in a set sequence which was repeated for several minutes.

Active teaching behaviors were recorded simply as performed or not performed during the observation period. Interactions and dialogue between student(s) and teacher were also noted, as well as a description of the classroom environment.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were developed to gather information from the principal, part-time teacher, special education teacher, and parents of the students in the eleven participating schools. A meeting with the District Special Education Specialist, a literature review, and consultations with a member of the College of Education Special Education faculty and the executive director of the Hawaii Association for Children With Learning Disabilities helped identify issues and concerns which the questionnaires should address.

A draft of the teacher questionnaire was presented at a meeting of project school principals and teachers. Participants were asked to review the questionnaires and submit comments and recommendations. Several changes were made to the questionnaire based on this feedback. Reviews of the principal, teacher, and parent questionnaires were done by the College of Education consultant.

Questionnaires were delivered to the school and distributed to the principals (11), part-time teachers (6), special education teachers (11) and parents (221). Teachers assisted in the distribution and collection of parent questionnaires via students.

Interviews

Attached to the parent questionnaire was a letter asking for parents' cooperation in the interview component of the project. Parents willing to be interviewed were asked for their telephone number or if they preferred to call the project staff to arrange an interview.

Parents who gave their phone numbers were called, and an interview was scheduled. Interviews averaged about one hour. Parents from all but two schools, one comparison and one project, were interviewed.

Short interviews with teachers were also conducted at the time the observation visit was made. Several teachers shared special forms they had developed to monitor students' progress.

RESULTS

In this section the results are organized and discussed by the method of data collection. However, where applicable, supporting data collected by another method are provided or referenced. Conferences with the District Specialist are also being planned to share specific results. The presentation of the results is lengthy, and the reader may refer to the final section for a short summary of the data.

Student Data

The Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT) were administered to project and comparison school students as a pretest in November 1984 and as a posttest in April 1985. The District Office handled all administrative procedures, including scoring of the test. Test scores were made available to the evaluation staff. The District Office also shared attendance data recorded by the teacher, participation in related services, and student record profiles. These have been compiled and summarized in the results section.

Table 1 describes the student population of comparison and project schools based on students who took the MAT and on student record profiles. Comparison schools had a higher proportion of fourth through sixth graders (79%) than did project schools (61%). Kindergarten through third graders accounted for 21% and 39% of the schools' population respectively. Boys comprised about three-fifths of the students at all schools. Students were about equally divided by type of service delivery--resource program, integrated self-contained, or full-time self-contained. The average student age at initial placement in the special education program was about eight years for both types of schools.

Students from comparison and project schools had the same mean number of days of absences (9 days) and tardiness (3 days) throughout the school year. Generally these were recorded absences from and tardiness to school and not necessarily from the special education class. During classroom observations, students were not always promptly in class at the start of the period. Apparently such data were not recorded.

Table 1. Percent Comparison of Student Population by Grade, Gender, and Type of Arrangement

Variable	Comparison Schools n = 126	Project Schools n = 112
Grade		
K-1	6%	10%
2-3	15%	29%
4-6	79%	61%
Gender		
Female	37%	28%
Male	55%	62%
Not Indicated	8%	11%
Arrangement		
Resource	46%	44%
Integrated Self-Contained	52%	51%
Full-time Self-Contained	2%	2%
Not Indicated	--	4%

Table 2 shows mean pretest and posttest scaled scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Several types of scores were available for comparison. Scaled scores were selected for evaluation based on the MAT Teacher's Manual (1978) recommendations to use scaled scores to compare performance among battery levels (i.e., students are administered different levels of the test, and scores need to be equated) and to measure change in achievement over a period of time. Complete data were available for 204 students. Mean posttest scaled scores showed improvement over mean pretest scores in all subject areas. Paired comparisons of the difference between the pretest and posttest scaled scores were statistically significantly greater than zero (Table 3).

On the average both comparison and project school children achieved higher scaled scores on the posttest than on the pretest. Data showed comparison school children starting with higher mean pretest scores followed by higher mean posttest scores than those achieved by the project school children. Project school children, however, showed greater gain between pretest and posttest scores.

Table 2. Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scaled Scores on Metropolitan Achievement Tests

School and Test Subject	Pretest Score	Posttest Score
Comparison Schools (n=120)		
Reading	578	597
Mathematics	497	527
Language	461	505
Total	505	537
Project Schools (n=84)		
Reading	560	591
Mathematics	485	521
Language	452	498
Total	488	529

Table 3. Paired Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Score Differences on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests

	Mean Differences Between Posttest and Pretest Scores	
Test Subject	Comparison Schools n = 120	Project Schools n = 84
Reading	19*	32*
Mathematics	30*	37*
Language	44*	47*
Total	33*	41*

* $p<.01$

To determine whether this higher gain was significant, a covariance analysis was run to control for the difference in pretest scores between schools. Interestingly project school students scored higher adjusted mean posttest scores in mathematics, reading, and the total battery in contrast to the comparison school children. Differences in scores however, were not statistically significant. Adjusted mean posttest language scores were the same for students of both school samples. Possibly project school children are benefiting from an extra instructor in the program and are showing greater gains. Next year's MAT results should be revealing in measuring whether project school children can attain 1985 pretest scores which are similar to this year's posttest scores, and whether they can again show higher gains than comparison school children.

Questionnaires

Parents

Of the 221 parent questionnaires distributed, 71 were returned. More parents of project school (43%) than of comparison school (23%) students returned the questionnaire. Why more project school parents returned the questionnaire is unclear. Possibly because project school teachers were more aware of the evaluation and the project in general they made a greater effort to get students to return questionnaires than did comparison school teachers. The breakdown by grade is shown in Table 4. Respondents do reflect the higher proportion of upper elementary students in the special education program in general as well as the higher proportion of primary level students in the project schools specifically.

Table 4. Distribution of Project and Comparison School Parents by Child's Grade

	Grade					
School	K - 1	2 - 3	4 - 5	6	Not Indicated	Total
Project	6	9	16	11	1	43
Control	1	3	13	11	0	28

Parents whether of project or comparison schools were similarly informed about their child's progress in school. A combination of conferences or letters kept parents updated about their child's performance and problems. Generally the special education teacher rather than the regular education teacher informed parents about their child. Thus parents' contacts with the special education teachers were much more frequent than with regular education teachers in both project and comparison schools. Forty-six percent of the parents in both types of schools reported three or more contacts with special education teachers in this school year. On the other hand 10% of the parents reported no contacts with regular education teachers, and 37% reported three or more contacts.

It was hypothesized that the addition of a part-time teacher would possibly increase the number of contacts with parents as compared to the previous school year. Responses to both principal and teacher questionnaires indicated that conferences with parents was an important area in which

special education teachers should increase their involvement. Such an increase, however, did not occur. Parents may have had difficulty accurately recalling what happened last year, and the number of contacts could be underreported. As mentioned earlier parents in project and comparison schools were similarly distributed by number of contacts with the special education teacher this year. Although contacts were higher in this school year than compared to last year, the increase in percentage points was the same for both project and comparison schools.

The presence of another teacher in their child's special education classroom was not known by all the project school parents interviewed. Some parents had been introduced to the part-time teacher, a few had heard their child refer to another person in the classroom but were unaware of what that person did, and many did not know there had been a part-time teacher.

When in need of information about their child's school work, parents were likely to ask the special education teacher or a combination of the special education teacher and other school staff for this information. Both project and comparison schools reported this practice by a similar percentage of parents. When asked how parents would like to be informed, the highest percentage (63%) of parents of project schools replied by joint conference of special and regular education teachers as compared to telephone, letter, or separate conferences. Our parent interviews indicated this practice was very rare and occurred only because the parent could not attend separate conference dates.

Parents in comparison schools preferred conferences, too, but did not select joint conferences (39%) as often as did project school parents. Conference with the special education teacher alone was prefered by 64% of the control school parents in comparison to 37% of the project school parents. Likewise conference with the regular education teacher alone was chosen by 50% and 23% of the parents respectively. Table 5 compares methods by project and comparison schools.

Table 5. Parents' Preference of Methods to Inform Them about Their Child's School Work*

School	N	Method					
		Phone	Conf. w/ S. Ed. Tch	Conf. w/ R. Ed. Tch	Joint Conf.	Letter	Other
Project	43	26%	37%	23%	63%	30%	2%
Comparison	28	21%	64%	50%	39%	32%	4%

* Parents were asked to check all methods they prefer; therefore, percentages are greater than 100%.

Parents' involvement in their child's Individualized Education Program (IEP) plan varied between project and comparison schools. A greater proportion of parents of project school students indicated they were minimally involved in the IEP (40%) as compared to comparison school parents (14%). Parents of comparison school students, however, reported a greater percentage of noninvolvement (32%) in comparison to project school parents (16%). Similar percentages of parents in both school types had been heavily involved. There were several nonrespondents (14%) to this question. Table 6 gives the degree of parent involvement in the IEP plan.

Table 6. Degree of Parent Involvement in the IEP

School	N	Degree of Involvement									
		Heavily		Moderately		Minimally		Not Involved		No Response	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Project	43	5	12%	7	16%	17	40%	7	16%	7	16%
Control	28	5	18%	7	25%	4	14%	9	32%	3	11%

Interviews with parents supported the reported low involvement of parents in the preparation of the IEP plan. Parents indicated the plan had usually been prepared by the teacher before the meeting. The details were explained to the

parent and generally approved. Parents did not object to this method because many felt the teacher had the best knowledge of the child's performance. Most indicated they had been given the opportunity to voice objections or add to the plan. A few of our interviews were with parents whose first language was not English, and we conversed through an interpreter usually a relative or an older child. These parents, however, indicated they had gone to the IEP meeting alone and had had difficulty understanding what had been said.

Principal

Questionnaires were received from all principals of project (6) and comparison (5) schools. Principals were asked to rate the importance of several responsibilities of a part-time teacher on a scale of 1 (not important) to 5 (very important). There was unanimous agreement (Table 7) among all principals that the most important role of the part-time teacher was individual instruction of students. Principals rated conference with the regular education teacher as a highly important role (mean = 4.5) of the part-time teacher. Interestingly, teachers who were asked the same question gave this role a notably lower rating (mean = 3.7).

Principals of both project and comparison schools similarly rated group instruction of children and assistance in mainstreaming as important roles of part-time teachers. Responsibilities given lower ratings (mean between 3.0 and 4.0) were conferences with parents, recordkeeping, preparation of Individualized Education Program plan, administration of content area tests, consultation with principal, and provision of release time for the special education teacher to attend inservice training.

There were several roles for part-time teachers receiving different ratings by principals of project and comparison schools. The reduction of pupil/teacher ratio received a mean rating of 4.0 by comparison school principals, but a lower rating (mean = 3.5) by project school principals. The frequency distribution of responses showed where differences occurred. One comparison school principal did feel reduction of pupil/teacher ratio was not important (rating of 1), but four rated this role of high importance (rating of 4 or 5). Three project school principals gave this role an importance rating of 4 or 5 and three rated it 2 or 3. Preparation of classroom materials received a higher mean rating of importance (mean = 4.0) by comparison school principals than by project school principals (mean = 3.3). The same mean ratings respectively were given to the role conferences with special services staff. Finally consultation with other school staff received a mean importance rating of 4.0 by comparison school principals and 3.5 by project school principals.

Table 7. Mean Rating of Importance* by Principals to the Question, "What in Your Opinion Is, or Would Be the Role of the Part-time Teacher?"

Role	Comparison Schools N = 5	Project Schools N = 6
Individualized Instruction	5.0	5.0
Group Instruction	4.2	4.3
Reduction of Pupil/Teacher Ratio	4.0	3.5
Preparation of Materials	4.0	3.3
Conferences with Parents	3.8	3.8
Recordkeeping	4.0	3.6
Conferences with Regular Teacher	4.4	4.5
Conferences with Special Services	4.0	3.3
Preparation of IEP Plan	3.8	4.0
Administration of Tests	3.8	3.3
Consultation with Principal	3.8	3.2
Consultation with Other Staff	3.6	3.5
Provision of Release Time	3.8	4.0
Assistance with Mainstreaming	4.2	4.0

*5 = very important and 1 = not important

Principals were given the same list of roles as in the above question and asked what is or would be the role of the full-time special education teacher with the addition of a part-time teacher. Both individual instruction of students and preparation of the IEP plan were rated as very important by all principals. Generally principals gave all other roles except provision of release time for inservice training and recordkeeping a higher mean importance rating for the special education teacher than for the part-time teacher. In particular conferences with parents, the regular education teacher, special services staff, principal, and other school staff received mean ratings above four by principals of both project and comparison schools. Recordkeeping, preparation of classroom materials, and administration of tests received importance ratings of four or less by all principals.

The largest difference in responses between principals of both school types was found for reduction of pupil/teacher ratio. Comparison school principals gave this role a mean rating of four and the rating of project school principals averaged 2.7.

Table 8. Mean Rating of Importance* by Principals to The Question, "With the Addition of a Part-time Teacher What In Your Opinion Is or Would Be the Role of the Full-time Special Education Teacher?"

Role	Comparison Schools N = 5	Project Schools N = 6
Individualized Instruction	5.0	5.0
Group Instruction	4.4	4.8
Reduction of Pupil/Teacher Ratio	4.0	2.7
Preparation of Materials	3.6	4.0
Conferences with Parents	4.4	4.7
Recordkeeping	3.8	3.5
Conferences with Regular Teacher	4.6	4.7
Conferences with Special Services	4.0	4.5
Preparation of IEP Plan	5.0	5.0
Administration of Tests	4.0	3.7
Consultation with Principal	4.6	4.3
Consultation with Other Staff	4.6	4.3
Provision of Release Time	3.2	3.8
Assistance with Mainstreaming	4.6	4.5

*5 = very important and 1 = not important

All principals felt the part-time teacher should have a college degree, however, they differed in opinion on the type of additional training desired. Comparison school principals placed greater value on further training than did project school principals. Two project principals felt only a college degree was sufficient, and two indicated teaching experience or a professional diploma was also necessary. Two principals felt the qualifications of a part-time teacher should include certification in special education. All comparison school principals felt training beyond the college degree was necessary--two indicated teaching experience or professional diploma and three said special education certification.

Principals were asked several questions related to mainstreaming. One question required the rating of evaluation procedures used to determine when a child is ready to be mainstreamed. A rating of "5" was "very important" and a rating of "1" was "not important." All principals rated academic performance in the classroom as very important. A child's behavioral performance in the classroom, assessment by the special education teacher, and social relationships with peers were also rated highly by principals of both project and comparison schools. Principals of comparison schools placed higher importance on assessment by the regular education teacher and the special services staff and the opinion of parents than did project school principals. Test scores

received the lowest rating by all principals although the mean comparison school response (4.0) was higher than the mean project school response (3.3).

Table 9. Mean Rating of Importance* by Principals of Criteria to Determine When a Child Is Ready to be Mainstreamed

Criteria	Comparison Schools N = 5	Project Schools N = 6
Academic Performance in Classroom	5.0	5.0
Behavioral Performance in Classroom	5.0	4.8
Assessment by Spec. Ed. Teacher	4.8	4.8
Social Relationship with Peers	4.6	4.5
Assessment by Regular Ed. Teacher	4.8	4.2
Opinion of Parents	4.4	3.6
Assessment by Special Services Staff	4.2	3.3
Test Scores	4.0	3.3

*5 = very important and 1 = not important

Other questions on mainstreaming concerned communication between the special education and regular classroom teachers. When asked how frequently a special education teacher should consult with the child's regular classroom teacher, principals of both project and comparison schools were equally divided. Four principals, two from each type of school, felt meetings one or more times a week was needed. One principal of a comparison school and three of the project school principals said one to three times a month. One principal (comparison) suggested once a month meetings and two said as often as necessary or as needed.

Responses to the degree of involvement of the regular classroom teacher on the development of a child's IEP plan were similarly varied. A project school principal felt the regular teacher should be directly involved (attend meetings, write sections, etc.) in the testing, planning, preparation, and review of the IEP. Three comparison school and two project school principals would like regular classroom teachers to be consulted on a regular basis. Two comparison and three project school principals felt regular classroom teachers should be consulted as needed.

Principals were asked to openly comment on the opportunities provided for special education teachers to meet with regular classroom teachers. Generally teachers must find time on their own during recess, lunch, before and after school, and during their preparation period. Three principals mentioned that faculty meetings provided some time for dialogue. Meetings during instructional time were difficult. Two project school principals recognized that part-time teachers could be utilized to either meet with regular classroom teachers or to free the special education teacher to meet with regular classroom teachers. No such help was available for regular classroom teachers, explained one project school principal, expect in cases "of dire need" when "the principal or counselor could supervise the regular classroom." One comparison school principal admitted the need to provide more time for consultation between special education and regular education teachers.

Teacher

All teachers responded to the questionnaire. The sample included five comparison school teachers, six project school teachers, and six part-time teachers in the project schools. Project school teachers had fewer students (range of 15-25 students) than did comparison school teachers (range 23-26 students). Nine facilities were full classrooms, and two, one project and one comparison classroom, were half of a partitioned double classroom. Eight out of the eleven classrooms were situated where noise was heard during parts of the day or throughout most of the day. The distractions occurred in the morning, and during recesses and lunch break. Two project school classrooms had some noise, but teachers did not feel the noise was distracting. All teachers indicated their classrooms were close to available resources or of similar location as regular classrooms. As assessed by the principals on their questionnaire, their facilities were perceived as good or excellent in meetig the needs of their teacers and students.

Different patterns of teachers' involvement in instruction were seen between project and comparison schools. As expected comparison school teachers did all methods of instruction--one-to-one, small group (2-6 students), and large group (greater than 6 students)--everyday in all academic areas. With a part-time teacher in the classroom, project schools divided the responsibilities. Both part-time and project special education teachers were still involved in one-to-one instruction every day. In some schools small group work was divided between special education and part-time teachers into either reading and language, or mathematics responsibilities. Some part-time teachers were not involved in large group work.

Project school teachers were more frequently involved per week in conferences and consultations than were comparison school teachers. There was some involvement by four part-time teachers in conferences but not as frequently as was the case for the other teachers. Two part-time teachers were not involved in conferences during a typical week. Project school teachers were more frequently involved per week in conferences with the administrator and regular education teacher than were comparison school teachers. On the other hand, comparison school teachers were more frequently involved per week in conferences with parents and in scheduling and coordinating IEP conferences. Conferences with the diagnostic team involved similar time frequencies by project and comparison school teachers. Involvement in preparation of the IEP plan varied widely among project school teachers from no times during the week to 4-5 times a week. Generally comparison school teachers were involved once a week in preparing Individualized Education Program plans. Two part-time teachers met about once a week with the administrator and regular education teachers. Generally part-time teachers were not involved in conferences during a typical week.

Class organization and preparation required daily attention by project and comparison school teachers. Two part-time teachers reported involvement 4-5 times a week, three said 2-3 times a week, and one indicated no times during the week. Recordkeeping, planning lessons, and preparing classroom materials were daily activities for the majority of teachers including part-time teachers. Project school teachers reported most frequent involvement per week (2-3 times a week) in administration of tests than did comparison school teachers (one time a week).

Teachers were asked what the role of the part-time teacher is or would be and their responses provided an interesting comparison to the above question on their actual involvement in these tasks. Teachers rated the roles on a scale of 1 (not important) to 5 (very important). Individual instruction was rated as a very important role of part-time teachers by all respondents except one comparison school teacher. As discussed earlier principals were also in agreement with the importance of this role. In actuality part-time teachers were involved daily in this task. They were also involved in varying frequencies in group instruction, another highly rated responsibility. All part-time teachers perceived themselves as having a very important role in reducing the pupil/teacher ratio, a role which they actually fulfilled to a large extent considering enrollment in project school classrooms was already less than comparison school classrooms.

Generally conference and IEP responsibilities for the part-time teacher were seen as less important than instruction by project and comparison school teachers. Principals differed with teachers on the importance of only one role, conferences with the regular education teacher. Principals gave this responsibility a mean rating of 4.5 compared to 3.7 by teachers. Half of the part-time teachers felt conferences with parents, regular education teachers, principals, and special services staff were very important roles for themselves. Half gave these roles a rating of 3 or less. In practice two part-time teachers reported meeting with the administrator or regular classroom teacher during a typical week.

Teachers were divided in opinion on the importance of recordkeeping. Half felt this was an important role and half gave it a rating of 3 or less. Actual involvement reflected similar differences. Half of the part-time teachers were involved daily in recordkeeping, the other three reported zero to three times a week. Assistance in mainstreaming was perceived as a more important role of part-time teachers by these teacher themselves (mean = 4.7) and by project school teachers (mean = 4.3) than by comparison school teachers (mean = 3.6). A specific question on their actual involvement in mainstreaming was not asked of teachers. The evaluation team, however, interpreted mainstreaming to include conferences with regular education teachers, principals, and staff, and instruction, roles for which involvement data were collected. Part-time teachers considered themselves to have a rather important role (mean = 4.3) in administering tests in comparison to comparison and project school teachers (mean = 3.8). However, part-time teachers actually reported being involved once a week or less in this task.

Table 7. Mean Rating of Importance* by Teachers to the Question, "What Is or Would Be the Role of a Part-time Teacher in the Special Education Program?"

Role	Comparison Sch Sp Ed Teachers N = 5	Project Sch Sp Ed Teachers N = 6	Project Sch Part-time N = 6
Individualized Instruction	4.6	5.0	5.0
Group Instruction	4.6	5.0	4.6
Reduction of Class Ratio	4.6	4.8	5.0
Preparation of Materials	4.4	3.7	4.2
Conferences with Parents	3.6	3.5	3.8
Recordkeeping	4.0	3.5	3.5
Conferences with Reg. Ed. Teacher	3.6	3.7	3.8
Conferences with Spec. Serv. Staff	3.0	3.3	3.8
Preparation of IEP Plan	3.6	3.5	3.5
Administration of Tests	3.8	3.3	4.3
Consultation with Principal	3.2	3.3	4.0
Consultation with School Staff	3.2	3.3	3.8
Release Time for Inservice	3.2	4.2	4.2
Assistance in Mainstreaming	3.6	4.3	4.7

*5 = very important and 1 = not important

With the addition of a part-time teacher, teachers were asked in which area was it important for the special education teachers to increase their involvement. Individual instruction and preparation of IEP plan were rated by all teachers as very important areas in which the special education teachers should increase their involvement. Group instruction, reduction of pupil/teacher ratio, conference with regular education teacher, and mainstreaming received high mean importance ratings (range of 4.2 to 4.8). Part-time teachers felt it was more important for special education teachers to increase their involvement in conferences with the special services staff, principal, and other school staff (mean = 4.5, 4.5, 4.3 respectively) as compared to comparison and project school teachers (mean = 3.8, 3.7, 3.4 respectively). Comparison school teachers rated recordkeeping (mean = 4.6) and administration of tests (mean = 4.4) as more important areas than did project school and part-time teachers whose mean ratings for these roles were 3.3 and 3.7 respectively.

Table 8. Mean Rating of Importance* by Teachers to the Question, "With the Addition of a Part-time Teacher, in Which Area Should the Special Education Teacher Increase Her Involvement?"

Role	Control Sch Sp Ed Teachers N = 5	Project Sch Sp Ed Teachers N = 6	Project Sch Part-time N = 6
Individualized Instruction	5.0	5.0	4.7
Group Instruction	4.2	4.7	4.8
Reduction of Class Ratio	4.8	4.7	4.7
Preparation of Materials	4.4	4.0	4.2
Conferences with Parents	4.4	4.0	4.7
Recordkeeping	4.6	3.0	3.5
Conferences with Reg. Ed. Teacher	4.2	4.5	4.5
Conferences with Spec. Serv. Staff	3.8	3.8	4.5
Preparation of IEP Plan	5.0	4.5	5.0
Administration of Tests	4.4	4.0	3.3
Consultation with Principal	3.6	3.7	4.5
Consultation with School Staff	3.6	3.3	4.3
Release Time for Inservice	3.8	4.3	4.0
Assistance in Mainstreaming	4.2	4.7	4.3

*5 = very important and 1 = not important

All comparison and project school teachers except one were Department of Education certified special education teachers. Training of four of the teachers was in specific learning disabilities; six had studied other areas of emphasis. One of the part-time teachers was a certified special education teacher, two had taken university level courses in special education, two had worked with special education children, and one had no training in special education. This variance in training appears to reflect the range of opinions on the desired qualifications of a part-time teacher by project school principals. For five of the part-time teachers this was their first year of teaching special education children. All other teachers surveyed had from three to over ten years of teaching experience with special education children.

Progress reports were the method all teachers used regularly (every quarter for ten teachers, every semester for one) to inform parents of their child's progress in school. Five schools (four project and one comparison) used weekly or daily reporting to parents of homework assignments. Two comparison schools used a monthly reporting system of homework

assignments. Several of these reporting forms were shared with the evaluation team during the observation visit and are included in Appendix B. Scheduled parent conferences varied from 1-2 times a year for most teachers to monthly for two and even weekly for one teacher. Parent/teacher conferences scheduled jointly with the regular education teacher were held 1-2 times a year by eight teachers, monthly by one comparison school, and not at all by two project schools. Teachers' interpretation of joint scheduling is necessary to understand the results. Back-to-back conferences on the same day, meeting first with one teacher than the other was commonly reported by parents who were interviewed. However, only one parent reported attending a joint conference in which both the special education and regular education teachers were present.

Letters or notes were frequently used by project school teachers. Use of the telephone varied widely among teachers. Part-time teachers were less frequently involved than comparison or project school teachers in all of the methods except the progress reports. Three of the part-time teachers did indicate weekly or daily involvement with the reporting of homework assignments.

Four project school teachers reported generally attending inservice training courses more than four times a year. Two indicated attendance 2-3 times a year. Five of these teachers responded that the training somewhat adequately met their needs; one reported the training was not very adequate. Two comparison school teachers generally attended inservice training more than four times a year, one went 2-3 times a year, one once a year, and one never attended. Of those teachers who attended training, one reported that the training was very adequate and three indicated it was somewhat adequate. Five part-time teachers said they generally attended inservice training 3-4 times a year, one reported once a year. All part-time teachers indicated the training was somewhat adequate.

Observations

Classroom Description and Activities

Classrooms were arranged differently to suit the style and needs of individual teachers. Generally a classroom had a cluster of individual desks, one or more large desks for group work, and several carrels. Bulletin boards were usually well decorated and students' works were often displayed. Shelves were generally amply filled with workbooks, textbooks, and audiovisual materials. One project school had a microcomputer in the classroom. Distracting outside noise did not seem to bother either students or teachers.

Class size varied ranging from two to thirteen students during a time period. This number may have been smaller than usual because as explained earlier observations were done during the middle of May. Many students were out of the room being tested, on field trips, or engaged in assemblies and other end-of-school activities.

The common method of instruction in all classes was individual assignments which were checked by the special education or part-time teacher. Students were recognized by either raising their hand or going to the teacher. Time lapses before being helped were frequent. Interaction with the teacher was limited except when students were probed for the correct answer. A group of students working on individual assignments with a teacher at the table was also frequently observed. Students would be working on different workbooks, pages, or levels of a similar activity such as reading comprehension, letter combinations and sounds, or mathematics. Tutoring by a fellow student and students correcting each other's work were seen in two classrooms.

Group work of students engaged in the same activity like reading aloud was observed in five classrooms and was not a common method of instruction. An example of this type of activity was 5-6 students taking turns to read aloud from a book or a group dramatizing a story being read. To introduce a mathematics lesson a teacher explained division with a remainder on the board to three students. Following her presentation each student then did an example on the board before starting their worksheets. A third example was a class discussion of types of written communication. Students were asked to determine the audience to whom the communication was usually addressed and the purpose for writing it. There was much inquiry by the teacher and support of students' ideas. Another activity was eight minutes of exercises done by the class before the morning lessons began.

Intricate reward and incentive systems were observed in three project school classrooms. Points, stars, or chips were received for classroom work completed, homework completed, good behavior, and other accomplishments. One class of students had points deducted for negative behavior. These points could be traded for treats or the opportunity to paticipate in special activities at the end of the week. Two teachers, one from a project school, the other from a comparison school, gave out stickers for work completed successfully.

Academic Engagement Time

Coded data supported field note observations that students spent much of their time in special education classrooms working on their own and at their own pace. Control school students were observed working by themselves on

39% of the 292 time sampling points. During both the first and second visits of project schools, students were self-engaged during 41% of the observed sampling points. On these visits 239 and 366 time sampling points were completed respectively. Small group (2-6 students) organization was seen in 32% of the comparison school observations, large group (greater than 6 students) in 19%, and one-to-one instruction in 10% of the time sampling points. Group organization differed between the first and second observation visits of the project schools. One-to-one instruction occurred on 38% of the observations during the first visit and 20% of the time during the second visit, small-group work 21% and 27% respectively and large-group work 0% and 12% respectively.

The availability of a part-time teacher may have increased the one-to-one contact seen more often in project schools. Furthermore project school students were observed to have a high degree of contact (direct contact or instruction) with their teacher or part-time teacher in about half of the observed time sampling points. In contrast high degree of contact with the teacher was observed in one-third of the time sampling points of comparison school classrooms and low degree of contact (student would have to get up and physically move to get the teacher's attention) was recorded 54% of the time. Low contact was observed more frequently (47% of observed sampling points) during the second visit of the project schools than the first visit (24% of observed sampling points). Medium contact (student would be able to get the teacher's attention with minimal effort) was observed in comparison schools in 10% of the sampling points, and in project schools 20% (first visit) and 10% (second visit) of the observations.

Table 9. Observed Time Frequencies of Group Setting and Degree of Contact with Teacher in the Classroom

	Comparison Schools N = 5 TSP = 292	Project Schools 1st Observation N = 6 TSP = 239	Project Schools 2nd Observation N = 6 TSP = 366
Group Setting			
Self	39%	41%	41%
One-to-one	10%	38%	20%
Small Group	32%	21%	27%
Large Group	19%	0%	12%
Degree of Contact			
High	36%	56%	43%
Medium	10%	20%	10%
Low	54%	24%	47%

TSP = Time Sampling Points; The frequencies are based on this number.

In each of the classes visited the observer collected time sampling data on student engagement. Observers recorded whether students were engaged academically, not engaged, or involved in interim activities such as getting materials for another lesson.

Frequencies on student engagement time were tabulated for each comparison and project school. The number of samplings done on each teacher varied and the frequencies were weighted to account for this variance. The mean engagement rates were 69% for students in comparison schools and 79% and 75% for students during the first and second visits respectively of project schools. Student time on task ranged from 54% to 83% in comparison schools and 58% to 92% in project schools. Higher mean engagement rates were found when students were in high rather than low contact with an adult. Again the availability of a part-time teacher which may have increased high contact with students, may have raised engagement rates in project schools as compared to comparison schools.

A mean nonengaged rate of about 13% was seen in both samples of schools. Interim activities accounted for 19% of the engaged time in comparison schools and 7% (first visit) and 13% (second visit) of project schools. Project school students were more often observed in reading and mathematics lessons than were comparison school students who were widely involved in language skills, writing, and other activites as well.

A separate analysis of engagement time when in contact with part-time teachers was done on project schools. Although more than half of the total time sampling points were observations on the part-time teacher, this sampling was smaller than desirable. Furthermore, because the number of observations on the part-time teacher varied widely among schools, the results should be interpreted cautiously. On average the engagement rate of students in contact with the part-time teacher was 78% (first visit) and 70% (second visit). On both occasions the rate for the part-time was slightly lower than the overall mean percentages. Mean nonengaged rates for the part-time teacher was a high 13% on the first visit and dropped to 8% on the second visit, a notably lower figure than the overall finding.

Engagement rates by group arrangement were compared. Mean percentages of students engaged in individual assignments were 71% and 76% for first and second visits to project schools respectively. Small-group work involving two to six students showed higher mean on task percentages, 86% (first visit) and 83% (second visit) than individual work. These differences in engagement rate by group setting were not seen in comparison schools where small-group work engaged students 49% of the time and individual assignments 17% of the time. In comparison to project schools these engagement rates were notably lower for either arrangement.

Active Teaching Behaviors

The research literature suggests that several teaching variables are causally related to student achievement (Walberg. et al., 1983). Observers used a modification of an instrument developed by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development to collect data on the use of these variables by teachers in the study. In any given lesson, teachers are not expected to use all the behaviors on the list; however, the overall low use of specific behaviors may mean that some teachers do not have those behaviors in their repertoire. Table 10 presents a summary of the use of these teaching behaviors in the observed classrooms. The data represent performance or nonperformance; the number of times the behavior occurred in each classroom was not recorded.

Table 10. Number of Teachers Using Active Teaching Behaviors

Teaching Behaviors	Comparison Schools N = 5	Project Schools* N = 6
1. The teacher actively presented instruction/information.		
a) Stated what students were to learn in lesson	1	2
b) Outlined the lesson before proceeding	1	1
c) Explained concepts, definitions, etc.	2	3
d) Reviewed goals, previous related instruction	0	2
e) Illustrated how to do the work	2	4
f) Questioned to see if students understood	4	4
g) Answered students' questions about what to do	2	4
h) Summarized what was presented or had been done	1	1
i) Moved the class quickly between activities	4	5
2. The teacher established and maintained engagement of students in instruction, tasks, activitites.		
a) Told students to attend to tasks	4	5
b) Explained rules of behavior	3	4
c) Signalled students to get to work	2	3
d) Resolved potential disruptions	2	1
e) Resolved student misbehavior	2	3
f) Told students their behavior was appropriate or inappropriate	3	5
g) Encouraged students to keep up	2	4
h) Sustained momentum in the lesson	4	4
i) Adjusted instruction to students' speed	0	4

Table 10 continued. Number of Teachers Using Active Teachers Behaviors

3.	The teacher monitored students' progress in learning, completing tasks.		
	a) Scanned the room to see if everyone was working	3	4
	b) Reviewed students' work when it was completed	4	6
	c) Recorded students' work when it was completed	3	5
	d) Monitored students' responses	4	4
	e) Roamed the room, checking students' work	3	5
	f) Questioned students: learned a concept, a fact	3	2
	g) Encouraged inquiry by students to clarify, explain concepts	3	1
	h) Used students' ideas to clarify, expand, reinforce concepts	2	1
	i) Collected students' work	1	4
4.	The teacher provided instructional feedback to student		
	a) Told student answer (work) was correct or not	4	6
	b) Provided "key" so students could check answers	1	3
	c) Modeled appropriate responses for students	0	3
	d) Demonstrated how to complete work correctly	1	1
	e) Encouraged or supported students for work completed correctly	3	5
	f) Responded to cultural clues and used to further instruction	0	1
	g) Promoted self-concept or self-esteem of students	3	1

* Data are from first observation visits. Four part-time teachers were coded individually. Both part-time and special education teacher were coded in two classrooms.

Because the numbers are few comparisons are difficult to describe. Stating what students were to learn, outlining the lesson, and reviewing and summarizing work were generally seen less frequently in both project and comparison schools. Adjusting instruction to student's speed, collecting student's work, and modeling appropriate responses for students occured in more project than comparison schools.

Interviews

The utilization of parent interviews for data collection is rare because of the time required of a parent and of the interviewer in scheduling appointments. However, because of the summer interim, the evaluators felt parents would be open to interviews and be flexible about scheduling appointments. In addition parents are an integral part of the special education certification and evaluation process and would likely provide valuable input to the study. The parents interviewed were indeed willing to share information and were sincerely concerned about the influence of special education on their child. Twenty-five parent interviews were completed and included ten from comparison schools and 15 from project schools. There was general satisfaction with the help children were receiving from the special education program. Furthermore both parents and children liked and respected the special education teacher. Some children had been detected during preschool years or kindergarten as needing special services, and their parents were grateful that help had begun early. On the other hand some parents were unhappy because their child had been certified in later grades and now seemed to be far behind their grade level. A teacher expressed similar concern about the two-grade-level deficit that is a guideline in determining certification. By the time children receive special services the amount of catch-up work required is immense.

Mainstreaming was another critical issue of parents, particularly those of fifth and sixth graders. These parents were anxious about their child's placement in the seventh grade. They wanted their child to receive the kind of assistance which would help the child confidently handle work given in the regular classroom. Parents were concerned that the regular education teacher was not always aware of what their child was learning in the special education classroom. There were sometimes conflicts in the assessment by both teachers on what the child was capable of doing. Homework assignments were not always coordinated resulting in lots of homework on some days and none on other days. Similarly supplies required were not coordinated so a parent would buy extra items as requested for the special education class, and later the child would bring home similar unused items from the regular class. Parents mentioned some services being provided to facilitate mainstreaming and open communication between regular and special education teachers. One parent reported going with the special education teacher to talk with the regular classroom teacher. Another said the same materials used in regular classrooms were given to children in the special classes. One parent offered the suggestion of special education teachers spending time in childrens' regular classrooms providing help with assignments given there. One project school is already considering such assistance. Regular education teachers at the school were asked in an intervention assessment questionnaire whether this service can

be implemented in their classrooms in September, 1985. All regular classroom teachers responding (7) agreed to the idea.

Social promotion was a concern of two guardians of immigrant children who were struggling in class but were promoted to the next grade level because of their age. Parents themselves expressed a need to lower the ratio of students to teacher. A parent who at one time observed fifteen children in the class to one teacher felt this ratio was too high. Several parents also reported that their child was being teased by other children in school and were torn between the need for special services versus the desire for normal social relationships for their child.

The IEP was generally accepted as a useful tool by parents who had great confidence in the teacher's ability to know what was academically best for their child. One parent questioned whether parents really understood the IEP which contains a lot of words, and whether objectives such as attainment of 80% of performance in an area could be accurately measured. Another parent felt the IEP should be shared with the parent before the meeting so that questions could be prepared ahead of time. Teachers have also tried to make the IEP more manageable for themselves in terms of monitoring student progress and for parents in helping them understand its use. Two teachers shared IEP forms they had developed and these are included in Appendix B.

LITERATURE REVIEW ON TIME AND LEARNING

Several time and learning studies have researched the association of time on task and student achievement (Fredrick & Walberg, 1980). The theory implies that learning is determined by the amount of time allocated to a subject as well as the percentage of time students are engaged in a task.

The Follow Through observation study (Stallings, 1975) reported that time spent in mathematics, reading, and academic verbal interactions was related to achievement. Furthermore, time spent in small groups (as opposed to one-to-one instruction) was associated with student academic gain. Another study by Stallings (1980) was conducted in remedial reading classrooms of secondary schools. Variables positively related to reading gain were described as Interactive On-Task instruction and included activites such as discussion/review, reading aloud, praise and support, and positive corrective feedback. Noninteractive On-Task instruction (monitoring students working on written assignments or reading silently) and Off-Task activities (behavior problems and transition time) were related to low or no gain.

Good and Becherman (1978) reported a time-on-task study of sixth grade classrooms. A higher percentage of pupils who were definitely involved were observed in small or large group activity with the teacher than in individual or whole-class activities. A comparison of low achievers and high achievers found time involved on task was less for the former than the later.

A study of nine elementary schools by Thurlow, et. al. (1982a) compared the nature of instruction and academic responding time between learning disabled (LD) and nonlearning disabled (non-LD) students over the entire school day. Learning disabled students were found to receive significantly more individual instruction and more instruction with the teacher at their side than non-LD students. Low academic responding time accounting for 25% of students' responding time was found for both LD and non-LD students. The study, however, was not able to find a clear relationship between achievement and responding time.

A followup study (Thurlow, et.al., 1982b) distinguished between time spent by LD students in regular and resource classrooms. LD students were most often instructed in individual and small-group arrangements while in the resource room but spent the largest percentage of time in entire-group structure in the regular classroom. LD students received more teacher approval in the resource room than in the regular classroom. LD students in the resource classroom received 25 times as much individual teaching as non-LD students in the regular classroom during the same time period.

Findings from the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study of elementary reading and mathematics classrooms showed that more time allocated to a particular content area resulted in higher achievement levels. Engagement rates were highly variable across classes and the variability was found to be related to achievement. Group settings yielded differences in engagement. Students working with a teacher were usually engaged 79-88% of the time and students working alone and pacing themselves were engaged 68-73% of the time. Interaction between teachers and students consisting of presentations of information, questioning and monitoring of students, and feedback was found to be associated with higher levels of student engagement.

Larrivee (1985) validated those teaching behaviors and skills which are effective for successful mainstreaming of students. A supportive instructional style and classroom environment were correlated with learning gains. This learner support system included the use of positive and sustaining feedback, a high success rate (in response to questions or learning tasks), minimum student transitional or waiting time, and infrequent criticism or punitive intervention.

DISCUSSION

In the present evaluation study the high frequency of sampling points in which students were working alone provided sporadic observable interaction between teacher and student. Activities centered around completing and correcting workbook assignments. There was a sharp contrast in enthusiasm between students working alone and students in a group activity. In classrooms where discussion did occur, students were actively involved in contributing their ideas. One lively class discussion on how to clean fish served as an introduction to a reading assignment. The pacing was much slower for students engaged in individual work and teacher intervention because behavioral problems was frequently observed.

The discussion in this section will focus on the project school special education and part-time teachers and program. The presence and impart of the Instructional Assistance Component in the project schools will be explored.

The structuring of students' time in the special education class was similar among classes. Students were commonly observed entering a room and apparently knowing that they had to turn in their homework and find out their new assignments which were often posted on the chalkboard or written in students' folders. Starting the morning opening period with a common activity was observed in two classrooms and appeared to be an excellent time for teachers to acknowledge students' presence and also for students to feel part of a group. However, a few minutes later students were at their desk with their individual assignment. The opener was just that, not an introduction to what would follow. A group session before each instructional period was rare. Students raised their hands or walked up to the teacher's desk when they needed help. After completing the assignment, they had it checked, then looked up their next assignment and proceeded with it. Work was individually paced, performance of students was monitored, and feedback was immediate. The literature suggests these are important factors in learning. However, upon observation the operation seemed mechanical, the spontaniety of learning seemed lacking.

Monitoring or keeping track of student progress on instructional tasks was described by Fisher, Berliner, et al. (1980) as teacher questioning in a group seating or teacher circulating around the room and was differentiated from explanation specifically in response to student need. Explanation in response to need which most often occurred during seatwork was negatively associated with high student success in the BTES. In the present study observers could not always distinguish the kind of help, whether explanation or checking of work, that students were receiving. Students constantly sought the teacher's attention by raising their hands or walking over to the teacher. Recorded observations indicated the occurrence of both types of teaching behaviors, explanation in response to need and the checking of student

work. The highly desirable monitoring by teacher questioning, in a group setting was not common. Clearer data on how often students were in need of explanation may help determine whether assignments were too difficult or seatwork had not been adequately introduced or explained.

Questions were often student initiated rather than teacher directed. Students had limited opportunities to interact with each other in teacher-led lectures or discussions to exchange ideas or experiences or to review mutual assignments, and thus seemed anxious to make contact with their peers in other ways resulting in distractions and behavioral disruptions. Students were reminded to get back to work or reprimanded for inappropriate behavior. The research has shown that frequent use of such intervention is negatively associated with student learning. The effective teachers in Larrivee's study (1985) intervened an averaged of three times per hour. Punitive interventions were observed less than 4% of the time. Supportive behaviors including individual assistance, further explanation, encouragement, and affection were the preferred intervention strategies. Students of the teachers in Larrivee's study remained on task an average of 85% of the time.

Although students were observed to be on task, the difficulty for a coder to make a decision was real. Was the student who was looking at an open workbook or paper with pencil in hand thinking or daydreaming? Moving lips or use of fingers for mathematics was discernible but students spent valuable seconds looking at open workbooks. Were the lessons too difficult for them? Did the students not understand what they were supposed to do or why they were doing it?

The part-time teacher was being utilized to assist in instruction as the project intended. Project school students were receiving one-to-one instruction and direct contact with their teachers more often than comparison school students. At what point does one-to-one instruction lose its effectiveness? Larrivee (1985) found that effective teachers made greater use of grouping practices than one-to-one instruction. Effective teachers were found to spend 62% of class time in small-group work including individualized instruction, and 38% of the time in large-group instruction. One-to-one instruction accounted for 15% of the individualized instruction. Several studies have mentioned higher engagement rates of students taught in group rather than individually (Stalling, 1980, Good and Becherman, 1978).

One-to-one instruction was seen as desirable by parents who, however, were aware that such interaction could not occur as frequently in their child's regular classroom. Close attention to students by the special education teacher was also perceived by several parents as the reason their child enjoyed and sometimes even preferred the special class. Two parents described the "caring nature" of their child's special

education teacher. Mainstreaming students is a critical issue here if children in special classes come to expect individual attention which is less likely to occur in their regular classroom.

The use of a part-time teacher to free the special education teacher to consult more closely with the regular education teacher was seen as a desirable role by the College of Education consultant. Responses to the questionnaires did indicate that principals and part-time teachers felt special education teachers should increase their role in such conferences. Special education teachers, however, did not give this role as high a rating. Several parents commented on the movement of their child between classes in response to a question on mainstreaming their child. They were concerned about their child missing work being given in the regular classroom. They were concerned about their child not receiving adequate help on work done in the regular classroom. They wondered if regular education teachers knew what their child was learning in special education. Nearly all parents were told their child was progressing. But how did this progress relate to the child's functioning in the regular classroom?

In only one school did a part-time teacher appear to be actively involved in facilitating mainstreaming. An intervention survey was sent to regular education teachers at the end of the school year to assess how the special education program had helped the children function in their regular classes. Responses by the regular education teachers were favorable. (See Appendix B-1.)

Parents appear to be in regular contact with the special education teacher at least annually at the IEP meeting and in most cases several other times through progress report conferences, notes, or telephone calls. An extra teacher in the program did not increase contacts with parents or otherwise affect communication with the home. Parents in need of information about their child stopped by their child's classroom or wrote notes to the teacher. Although parents seemed to feel they could get information, they had many questions to ask the interviewers. How can I help my child at home? What will happen when my child goes to seventh grade? My child is being teased about receiving special instruction, what can I do? When will my child be able to stay in the regular classroom?

Interviewed parents comprised about one-third of the respondents to the questionnaire. Those who opted for the interview probably included parents with high interest in their child's academic progress and knowledgeable about their child's needs. Given these considerations the next question is "How can the work of the part-time and special education teacher be effectively planned so that the program can be responsive to parents' concerns and students' needs?" Effective mainstreaming and communication with the regular education teacher must also fit into this plan. Support from the principal and other school staff is critical.

Honolulu District Office scheduled three project meetings for the part-time teachers. One was a true inserving on classroom management, the others were on project and MAT orientation. The training and experience of the part-time teachers varied upon entry into the project and likewise their instructional assignments differed from school to school. Additional training may be necessary to tighten their competencies and to establish common project goals and strategies for utilizing the part-time teacher to attain these goals. Having a part-time teacher with special education training seemed to be a positive factor in meeting the objectives of the project and should be considered a desirable qualification for the position.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An evaluation of the Instructional Assistance Component of the Honolulu District Office, Special Education, was conducted in April-July, 1985. Six project and five comparison elementary schools participated in the evaluation. Data were collected through classroom observations, parent and teacher interviews, and questionnaires given to principals, teachers, and parents. Honolulu District Office administered the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in November 1984 and April 1985 and the pretest and posttest scores were made available to the evaluation staff.

One-to-one instruction as well as high degree of contact with the teacher occurred more frequently in project schools than in comparison schools. Overall children working by themselves was observed more frequently than group work or one-to-one instruction. Students in project school classrooms were observed engaged in their task during 75% to 79% of the time sampling points compared to a 69% engagement rate by comparison school students. Some of the active teaching behaviors such as stating what students are to learn, outlining the lessons, and reviewing and summarizing work were observed in few classrooms. Questioning to see if students understood, telling students to attend to task, and telling students their answer was correct or incorrect were more commonly observed.

Parent interviews indicated they were generally satisfied with the special education program and teacher. Areas of their concern included late identification of need for special services, mainstreaming, communication between the special education and regular education teachers, and labeling and teasing of children in special classes by their classmates.

Special education teachers of project schools appreciated their part-time teachers, and some comparison school teachers felt they could also use extra help. Instructional responsibilities assigned to the part-time teacher varied among the project schools. Some were responsible for students of designated grade levels, others for the subject matter area. A variety of classroom managerial and structural methods were described by teachers or observed in the classroom.

Principals and teachers were in agreement that the primary role of the part-time teacher was instruction of students. In fact part-time teachers reported that their most frequent involvement was in instruction. With the addition of a part-time teacher, the major roles of the special education teacher were seen as instruction and preparation of IEP plans. Their role in conferences with parents and staff was given higher ratings of importance by principals and part-time teachers than by the special education teachers themselves. Principals reported that before and after school, recesses, lunch break, preparation periods, and faculty meetings were times available for the special education teacher to meet with the regular education teachers and other staff. Principals recognized the difficulty of providing time for open communication during the school day.

An expansion of the project is already underway for the school year 1985-86. There are several recommendations.

1. Identify common project goals and strategies for the part-time teacher and special education teacher team. These include strategies to facilitate mainstreaming, address parental concerns, open communication with the regular education teacher, and insure children are receiving appropriate instruction.

2. Reevaluate appropriateness of instructional material particularly seatwork materials for each child. When seatwork materials are used, make sure students are prepared (assignment introduced and directions understood) to work on their assignment.

3. Provide inservice training which promote teaching behaviors found to be effective with special-needs students. These behaviors include positive and encouraging feedback, sustaining feedback, limited criticism, accurate diagnoses, proper presentation to insure clarity and understanding of expectations, and teacher-directed group activities including question and answer, review, discussion, and summarizing.

4. Reassess monitoring techniques. Monitoring by question and answer versus checking whether work is correct or incorrect, and by moving around the room versus remaining in one place result in increased engagement time.

5. Reassess the demands of individualizing instruction to the extent it requires extensive recordkeeping of skills mastered, continuous selection and assignment of learning tasks, and meticulous monitoring of students' progress at the expense of pupil-teacher interaction. Of course teachers must remain responsive to individual students' needs. The method of attaining this goal should include a balance of instructional practices.

6. Inform all faculty, staff, and parents of special education children (letter to parents is probably adequate) in project schools about the Instructional Assistance Component. Inform comparison school principals and teachers about the project as well as the specific content of their involvement in the evaluation in writing.

7. Continue evaluation through year 2 of the project. Data collection should be ongoing throughout the school year. Mainstreaming activities in particular need further study.

Honolulu District Office has taken the initiative in providing part-time teachers on a pilot basis to special education programs of selected schools. Hiring of part-time teachers addresses the issue of lowering the pupil/teacher ratio in special education classes. The evaluation showed that a lower ratio did result in a higher number of teacher-student contacts in project as opposed to comparison schools. However, number of contacts is not the only indicator. Other factors, namely the effectiveness of the teaching environment in maximizing the interaction of the contact and the successful mainstreaming of children, should be given top priority in the second year of the project.

References

Center on Evaluation, Development and Research. (1984). Time and learning. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.

Frederick, W.C. and Walberg, H.J. (1980). Learning as a function of time. The Journal of Educational Research. 73:183-194.

Fisher, C.W., Berliner, D.C. Filby, N.N., Marliave, R. Cahen, L.S., and Dishaw, M.M. (1980). Teaching behaviors, academic learning time, and student achievement: An overview. A Time to Learn. Washington D.C., National Institute of Education.

Fisher, C.W., Guthrie, L.F., Mandinach, E.B., (1983). Significant Bilingual Features Study. Verification of Bilingual Instruction Features. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Good, T.L. and Becherman, T.M. (1978). Time on task: A Naturalistic study in sith-grade classrooms. The Elementary School Journal. 78(3):193-201.

Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Larrivee, Barbara. (1985). Effective teaching for Successful Mainstreaming. Research on Teaching Monograph Series. New York: Longman Inc.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Teacher's Manual for Administering and Interpreting. USA: The Psychological Corporation. 1978.

Moos, R.H. (1979). Evaluating educational environments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Riat, R.C. (1975). Ethnographic techniques and the study of an urban school. Urban Education, 10(1):86-108.

Sabatino, D.A., Miller, T.L., Schmidt, C. (1981). Learning disabilities: Systemizing teaching and service delivery. Maryland: Aspen Systems Corporation.

Stalling, Jane. (1975). Implementation and child effectsof teaching practices in Follow Through classrooms. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. 40 (Serial No. 163).

Stalling, Jane. (1980). Allocated academic learning time revisited, or beyond time on task. Educational Researcher. 9(11):11-16.

Thurlow, M.L., Graden, J.. Greener, J.W., and Yaseldyke, J.E. (1982). Academic responding time for LD and non-LD students. Research Report No. 72. Minnesota: Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities, University of Minnesota.

Thurlow, M.L., Yaseldyke, J.E., Graden, J.L. (1982). LD students' active academic responding in regular and resource classrooms. Research Report No. 90. Minnesota: Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities, University of Minnesota.

Walberg, H.J., Schiller, D., and Haertel, G.D. (1983). The Quiet Revolution in Educational Research In Developing and evaluating educational research. G.W. Moore ed. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Ward, B.A. and Tikunoff, W.J. (1978). A naturalistic study of the initiation of students into three classroom social systems. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto.

Appendix A

Evaluation Instruments

INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENT

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

School_____

1. What in your opinion is, or would be, the ROLE OF THE PART-TIME SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER? Please rate the following on a scale from most to least important.

	very important 5	4	3	2	1 not important
individualized instruction of children	____	____	____	____	____
group instruction of children	____	____	____	____	____
reduction of class ratio	____	____	____	____	____
preparation of classroom materials	____	____	____	____	____
conferences with parents	____	____	____	____	____
recordkeeping	____	____	____	____	____
conferences/consultation with regular classroom teacher	____	____	____	____	____
conferences/consultation with special services staff	____	____	____	____	____
preparation of Individualized Education Program Plan	____	____	____	____	____
administration of content area tests	____	____	____	____	____
consultation with principal	____	____	____	____	____
consultation with other school staff	____	____	____	____	____
provision of release time for full-time special education teacher to attend inservice training	____	____	____	____	____
assist in mainstreaming	____	____	____	____	____

2. With the addition of a part-time special education teacher to the present special education staff, what in your opinion is or would be the ROLE OF THE FULL-TIME SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER? Please rate the following activities from most to least important.

	very important 5	4	3	2	1 not important
individualized instruction of children	____	____	____	____	____
group instruction of children	____	____	____	____	____
reduction of class ratio	____	____	____	____	____
preparation of classroom materials	____	____	____	____	____
conferences with parents	____	____	____	____	____
recordkeeping	____	____	____	____	____
conferences/consultation with regular classroom teacher	____	____	____	____	____
conferences/consultation with special services staff	____	____	____	____	____

	very important 5	4	3	2	1 not import
preparation of Individualized Education Program Plan.....	____	____	____	____	____
administration of content area tests	____	____	____	____	____
consultation with principal.....	____	____	____	____	____
consultation with other school staff	____	____	____	____	____
provision of release time for part-time special education teacher to attend inservice training.....	____	____	____	____	____
assist in mainstreaming.....	____	____	____	____	____

3. What do you feel should be the qualifications of a part-time special education teacher?

____ teaching experience only
____ college degree only in any field including education
____ college degree in any field including education and teaching experience or professional diploma
____ college degree in education and special education certification
____ other - please describe_____
_____

4. How frequently do you feel a special education teacher should consult with the child's regular classroom teacher?

____ one or more times a week
____ one to three times a month
____ every other month
____ once or twice during the school year
____ other, please explain_____

5. What do you feel should be the involvement of the regular classroom teacher on the development of a child's Individualized Education Program (IEP) Plan?

____ directly involved (attend meeting, write sections, etc.) in testing, planning, preparation, and review
____ regularly consulted during testing, preparation and review
____ consulted as needed during testing, preparation and review
____ need not be involved

6. Rate how important you feel each of the following evaluation procedures are in determining when a child is ready to be mainstreamed.

	very important 5	4	3	2	1 not important
test scores	____	____	____	____	____
academic performance in classroom	____	____	____	____	____
social relationship with peers	____	____	____	____	____
behavioral performance in classroom	____	____	____	____	____
opinion of parents	____	____	____	____	____
assessment by special education teacher	____	____	____	____	____
assessment by regular classroom teacher	____	____	____	____	____
assessment by special services staff	____	____	____	____	____

7. Please rate the quality of your special education classroom facilities in meeting the needs of your teacher(s) and students.

excellent	good	fair	poor
4	3	2	1

8. What opportunities, if any, are provided for your special education teachers to meet with regular classroom teachers?

---

9. What opportunities, if any, are provided for other members of your school staff to meet with the special education teacher?

INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENT
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1) School _____

2) Part Time _____
Half Time _____
Full Time _____

3) Number and type of children in class

_____ Learning Disabled
_____ Emotionally Handicapped
_____ Minimally Mentally Retarded
_____ Moderately Mentally Retarded
_____ Speech or Visually Impaired

4) Description of special education classroom facilities.

a) Please describe your classroom facility (full classroom, partitioned classroom, portable, etc.). Indicate whether this setup is intentional or designed.

_____

_____

_____

b) What is the noise level in the area around your room?

4	3	2	1
noise throughout most of the day	some noise at certain times of the day-- indicate when _____ _____	some noise, but not distracting	very little noise, not distracting

c) What is the location of your room to available resources in school?

3	2	1
close to resources	of similar location (distance) as regular classrooms	distantly located from resources

5) Of your time spent in the the activities below, rate each one in terms of involvement during a typical week.

	4-5 times a week	2-3 times a week	1 time a week	no times a week
conferences/consultations	4	3	2	1
instruction	4	3	2	1
classroom organization and preparation	4	3	2	1

a) Of your time spent in conferences and consultations, rate each of the following activities in terms of involvement during a typical week.

	4-5 times a week	2-3 times a week	1 time a week	no times a week
conferences with parents	4	3	2	1
conferences/consultation with administrator	4	3	2	1
conferences/consultation with regular education teacher	4	3	2	1
conferences/consultation with diagnostic team	4	3	2	1
preparing Individualized Education Program (IEP)	4	3	2	1
scheduling and coordinating of participants for IEP conference	4	3	2	1

b) Of your time spent in instruction, rate each of the following activities in order terms of involvement during a typical week.

	4-5 times a week	2-3 times a week	1 time a week	no times a week
one-to-one teaching of academics (reading, writing, or language skills)	4	3	2	1
small (2-6 children) group work in reading and language skills	4	3	2	1
small (2-6 children) group work in math	4	3	2	1
large group work (>6 children) integrating reading, writing, math with content areas such as science and social studies	4	3	2	1
self-contained class instruction in all areas	4	3	2	1

c) Of your time spent in classroom preparation and organization, rate each of the following activities in terms of involvement during a typical week.

	4-5 times a week	2-3 times a week	1 time a week	no times a week
recordkeeping	4	3	2	1
planning lessons	4	3	2	1
preparing classroom materials	4	3	2	1
administering tests	4	3	2	1

6) Are you a Department of Education certified special education teacher?
____ Yes ____ No

If YES, please describe your area of emphasis.

If NO, which of the following describes your training in special education?
____ University level special education courses
____ Workshops in special education
____ Work experience with special education children
____ Other, please describe_____
____ None of the above

7) How many years have you been teaching special education children?
____ less than 1 year
____ 1 - 2 years
____ 3 - 5 years
____ 6 - 10 years
____ over 10 years

8) What is your degree of involvement in preparing an Individualized Education Program (IEP) plan?
____ does major testing for, and planning and writing of IEP
____ does some testing for, and planning and writing of IEP
____ does very little testing for, and planning and writing of IEP

9) About how often do you review each child's IEP?
____ once a month
____ once a semester
____ once a quarter
____ once every school year

10) Listed below are various ways you may have informed parents of their child's progress in the program. Indicate the <u>frequency per year</u> you use each to keep parent(s) informed.

	0	1-2	3-5	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
telephone conference	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
scheduled in-person conference	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
impromptu in-person conference	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
letter or note to parents	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
progress reports (report cards)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
parent-teacher conference scheduled jointly with regular education teacher	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Reporting on homework assignments	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

11) What do you feel is or would be the ROLE OF A PART TIME TEACHER in the special education program? Please rate the following on a scale from most to least important.

	very important	5	4	3	2	1	not important
individualized instruction of children		5	4	3	2	1	
instruction of children		5	4	3	2	1	
reduction of class ratio		5	4	3	2	1	
preparation of classroom materials		5	4	3	2	1	
conferences with parents		5	4	3	2	1	
recordkeeping		5	4	3	2	1	
conferences/consultation with regular classroom teacher		5	4	3	2	1	
conferences/consultation with special services staff		5	4	3	2	1	
preparation of Individualized Education Program plan		5	4	3	2	1	
administration of content area tests		5	4	3	2	1	
consultation with principal		5	4	3	2	1	
consultation with other school staff		5	4	3	2	1	
provision of release time for full-time special education teacher to attend inservice training		5	4	3	2	1	
assist in mainstreaming		5	4	3	2	1	

12) With the addition of a part time teacher to the special education staff, in which area do you feel it is important for the FULL TIME SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER to increase his or her involvement? Please rate the following activites from most to least important.

	very important	5	4	3	2	1	not important
individualized instruction of children		5	4	3	2	1	
group instruction of children		5	4	3	2	1	
reduction of class ratio		5	4	3	2	1	
preparation of classroom materials		5	4	3	2	1	
conferences with parents		5	4	3	2	1	
recordkeeping		5	4	3	2	1	
conferences/consultation with regular education teacher		5	4	3	2	1	
conferences/consultation with special services staff		5	4	3	2	1	
preparation of Individualized Education Program plan		5	4	3	2	1	
administration of content area tests		5	4	3	2	1	
consultation with principal		5	4	3	2	1	
consultation with other school staff		5	4	3	2	1	
provision of release time for part-time special education teacher to attend inservice training		5	4	3	2	1	
assist in mainstreaming		5	4	3	2	1	

13) What kinds of materials do you use in instruction? (check as many as apply)

____ commercial printed materials (workbooks, etc.,not textbooks)
____ government printed materials (not textbooks)
____ textbooks
____ manipulative materials (purchased)
____ audio visual (films, video, tape cassettes, flash cards, etc.) materials (purchased)
____ microcomputer tutorials or programming
____ teacher-developed materials, please describe_____
____ other, please describe_____

14a) Generally how often do you attend inservice training courses or workshops of all types -- (DOE or UH sponsored, on own time or during work day)

____ more than 4 times a year
____ 2 - 3 times a year
____ once a year
____ never

b) How adequately does the inservice training offered meet your needs?

____ very adequately
____ somewhat adequately
____ not very adequately
____ not at all adequately

c) I would like the following topics covered in inservice training. Please list._____

_____

_____

_____

15) Diagnostic testing (by special services staff) of children for certification in special education is:

____ very adequate
____ somewhat adequate
____ not very adequate
____ not at all adequate

16) The reports received from the diagnostic team are:

____ very useful
____ somewhat useful
____ not very useful
____ not at all useful

University of Hawaii at Manoa

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Curriculum Research and Development Group
(Including University Laboratory School)
Castle Memorial Hall 132 • 1776 University Avenue • Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Telephone: (808) 948-7961 • 948-7962

May 23, 1985

Dear Parent,

The Honolulu District Office of the State Department of Education is conducting a study of its special education program. The University of Hawai'i is helping to carry out this study. We would like your thoughts about your child and the special education program. Please complete the questionnaire and place it in the enclosed envelope. Have your child return the envelope with the completed questionnaire to the teacher. Your responses will be kept confidential.

If you have any questions, please call us at 948-7900 or 948-7793. Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Morris Lai Sandra Shimabukuro

Morris Lai and Sandra Shimabukuro
Evaluation Project Directors

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENT

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

School _____

Sex of child_____Male ____ Female

Grade of Child K 1 2 3 4 5 6 Age of child _____

Approximate date, if known, child was placed in special education program_____

1. How are you usually informed about your child's progress in school? (check one)

   ____ telephone call from special education teacher or other school staff
   ____ conference with special education teacher
   ____ conference with regular education teacher
   ____ conference with other school staff; please list staff_____
   _____
   ____ letter from the teacher or school
   ____ a combination of the above; please describe _____
   _____

2. How many contacts (telephone call, letter, conference, report cards, etc.) have you had with your child's special education teacher this school year?

   ____ 0 contacts this school year with special education teacher
   ____ 1 or 2 contacts this school year with special education teacher
   ____ 3 or 4 contacts this school year with special education teacher
   ____ 5 or more contacts this school year with special education teacher

3. How many contacts (telephone call, letter, conference, report cards, etc.) have you had with your child's regular education teacher this school year?

   ____ 0 contacts this school year with regular education teacher
   ____ 1 or 2 contacts this school year with regular education teacher
   ____ 3 or 4 contacts this school year with regular education teacher
   ____ 5 or more contacts this school year with regular education teacher

4. In previous school years about how many contacts per year did you usually have (through letter, telephone call, conference, report card, etc.) with your child's special education teacher?

____ 0 contacts in previous years with special education teacher
____ 1 or 2 contacts in previous years with special education teacher
____ 3 or 4 contacts in previous years with special education teacher
____ 5 or more contacts in previous years with special education teacher
____ child entered special education program this school year

5. In previous school years about how many contacts per year did you usually have (through letter, telephone call, conference, report card, etc.) with your child's regular education teacher?

____ 0 contacts in previous years with regular education teacher
____ 1 or 2 contacts in previous years with regular education teacher
____ 3 or 4 contacts in previous years with regular education teacher
____ 5 or more contacts in previous years with regular education teacher
____ this is child's first year in school.

6. Has your child received services from any of the following people or programs?

	yes	no	don't know
Speech and Hearing Therapist.....	____	____	____
Occupational Therapist.....	____	____	____
Physical Therapist.....	____	____	____
Students of Limited English Proficiency (SLEP) program.....	____	____	____
Department of Health, Mental Health Services.....	____	____	____
School Counselor.....	____	____	____
Social Worker.....	____	____	____
Psychological examiner.....	____	____	____
Other, please list_____	____	____	____
_____	____	____	____

7. What do you do when you want information about how your child is doing in school? (check one)

____ contact the principal
____ contact the counselor
____ contact the special education teacher
____ contact the regular education teacher
____ a combination of the above; please indicate which persons
_____
____ never had the need for information

8 By what means do you like to be informed about your child's work in school? (Check as many as apply)

____ telephone call from special education teacher or other school staff
____ conference with special education teacher
____ conference with regular education teacher
____ joint conference with both special education and regular classroom teachers
____ letter from the teacher or school
____ other, please explain _____

_____

9. Which area(s) are you most concerned about regarding your child's school work? (check as many as apply)

____ reading
____ writing
____ spelling
____ speech
____ mathematics
____ other areas, please list_____

_____

10. Within the last month which of the following activities did you do with your child?

	yes	no
Help with homework	____	____
Read books together	____	____
Write stories, letters, poems, etc. ...	____	____
Participate in sports or other recreational activities.....	____	____
Go to the supermarket.....	____	____
Watch TV.....	____	____
Other; please list _____	____	____
_____	____	____

11. In which of the following activities is your child now participating?

	yes	no
organized sports including swimming, karate, baseball, soccer, gymnastics, football, etc.....	____	____
dance lessons.....	____	____
music lessons.....	____	____
arts and crafts programs.....	____	____
private tutor for reading, math, etc...	____	____
after school foreign language programs.	____	____
other programs; please list _____	____	____
_____	____	____

12. To what degree were you involved in the preparation of your child's Individualized Education Program (IEP) Plan?

____ heavily involved (involved from the start in development and planning, attended IEP planning meeting and offered several suggestions, gave feedback to teacher and others)

____ moderately involved (attended IEP planning meeting and gave at most one or two suggestions)

____ minimally involved (attended IEP planning meeting and approved plan which had been prepared.

____ not involved

13. How often have you participated in the evaluation of your child's Individualized Education Program Plan this school year?

____ 2 or more times this school year
____ 1 time this school year
____ none yet, but evaluation being planned before June
____ other, please describe_____

What are your major concerns about your child and the special education program?

Clas om Observation Form
Student

INSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE PROJECT EVALUATION

ACADEMIC LEARNING TIME (ALT) OBSERVATION CODING SHEET

SHEET NO.

SITE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | CLASS | OBSERVER | DATE / /

TIME Hr	TIME Min	STU. NO.	SUBJECT MATTER R	M	L	W	O	CONTACT GROUP SIZE SI	1:1	2-6	>6	CONTACT DEGREE H	M	L	CONTACT BY I	PTI	O	ENGAGEMENT EA	M	I	ACCURACY ORAL A	O	WRITTEN A	O	C
		1	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		2	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		3	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		4	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Hr	Min																								
		1	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		2	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		3	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		4	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Hr	Min																								
		1	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		2	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		3	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		4	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
Hr	Min																								
		1	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		2	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		3	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5
		4	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5

ACRY RAIL U	M	L	C
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4

NOTES:

STUDENT IDENTIFICATION

Description	No. = I. D. No.
	1
	2
	3

50

55

56

INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT EVALUATION
TEACHER INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR RECORD

SITE: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 CLASS NUMBER:_____

TODAY'S DATE:_____ OBSERVER NUMBER:_____

LESSON TYPE: one to one small group 2-6 large group > 6

APPROXIMATE LESSON DURATION:_____

Below are listed those teacher behaviors which may have occured during the time you observed instruction for this lesson. For each, place a check mark in the appropriate box <u>if it occurred</u> (even if it occurred only once, you should check the box).

<u>1. The teacher actively presented instruction/information</u>

____ <u>Stated</u> what students were to learn in lesson (goals, objectives)

____ <u>Outlined</u> the lesson before proceeding

____ <u>Explained</u>: concepts, definitions, relationship of tasks to goals, etc.

____ <u>Reviewed</u>: goals, previous related instruction, etc.

____ <u>Illustrated</u>: how to do the work, how to do a problem, etc.

____ <u>Questioned</u> students to see if they understood

____ <u>Answered</u> student's questions about what they were to do

____ <u>Summarized</u>: what was presented, what class had done or learned, etc.

____ <u>Moved the class quickly</u> from one activity or lesson to another

<u>2. The teacher established and maintained engagement of students in instruction, tasks, activities</u>

____ <u>Told</u> students to attend to tasks (whole class or individually)

____ <u>Explained</u> the rules of behavior

____ <u>Signalled</u> students to get to work (turned off lights, eye contact, etc.)

____ <u>Resolved</u> potential disruptions

____ <u>Resolved</u> student misbehavior

____ Told students their behavior was appropriate or inappropriate

____ Encouraged students to keep up (maintain pace)

____ Sustained momentum in the lesson, not letting it slow down

____ Adjusted instruction (faster/slower) according to students' speed

3. The teacher monitored students' progress in learning, completing tasks

____ Scanned the room to see if everyone was working

____ Reviewed students' work when it was completed

____ Recorded students' work when it was completed

____ Monitored students' responses

____ Roamed the room, checking students' work

____ Questioned students: learned a concept, learned a fact, completed work

____ Encouraged inquiry (curiosity) by students to clarify, expand, reinforce concept

____ Used students' ideas to clarify, expand, reinforce concepts

____ Collected students' work

4. The teacher provided instructional feedback to students

____ Told student answer (work) was correct or incorrect

____ Provided "key" so students could check answers

____ Modeled appropriate responses for students

____ Demonstrated how to complete work correctly

____ Encouraged or supported students for work completed correctly

____ 5. The teacher responded to cultural cues (including pidgin, body language) and used these to further instruction

____ Promoted self-concept or self-esteem of students

Description of classroom:

Notes:

INSTRUCTIONAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENT

Parent Interview

1. Explain study: Research study to improve special education program, specifically learning disability program.

2. Thank you: We appreciate their help. Subtly try to determine why they decided to be interviewed. Did they feel like they were supposed to call us? Need not ask outright. During the interview their reason might become apparent.

3. Confidentiality: All responses will be kept confidential.

4. Are they satisfied with what DOE is providing in special education programs?

5. Good points (what parent likes) about the program?

6. Areas parent would like to see changed or improved.

7. Are they familiar with the IEP? Do they understand it? Is it of use to the parent?

8. How does parent like to be involved in helping child with schoolwork?

9. Do parents know enough of what's happening to child in school? If not how would they like to be kept informed?

10. If parent's first language is not English ask if parent is getting the information he or she would like to have about child.

11. If parent thinks of other things he or she would like to share, please tell them to call us again.

Appendix B

Report Forms Used by Project School Teachers

B-1 Lanakila School

B-2 Liholiho School

B-3 Lunalilo School

Appendix B-1 May 1985 Lanakila Elementary room C-10

57

INTERVENTION SURVEY SUMMARY

completed by Regular Ed. teachers with Special Needs students in their classrooms.

1. Primary areas of intervention (classroom work we are presently assisting student with.)

Language arts- spelling, book reviews, poetry, basic reading skills Social Studies and Science, accepting responsibility, and basic skills.

2. Unit pre/post test scores November 1984 to May 1985.
   a. Grade 6- E (4 times), S+ (3times), S(5 times), S- (3 times), U (4 times), missed 7 tests Spelling Units 1-28
   b. Grade 6- Science Unit 1 S+/S, Unit 2 S/S, Unit 3 E/E, Unit 4 E/Xcused, Unit 5 S/S, Unit 6 U/(not given yet) S+(5/23/85) E= -0, S+ = -1to-2,(98%), S= -3to-5 (80%), S- = -6to-8 (70%) U= -9to-12 (50%)
   c. Grade 3 Spelling (J.Y.) 58/42, 50/75, 67/75, 17/50, 6/92, 60/60, 60/100, 32/50, 70/70, 50/50, 60/80, 80/80, 30/100, 40/100, 100/100, 80/100, 100/100, 100/100
      Science 15/45
   d. Grade 3 Spelling (J.A.) from November 1984 to January 2, 1985 J.A. scored 0's. From January 2 - May 1985 scores are: 40/0, 0/10, 20/60, 20/30, 40/80, 50/90, 20/100
      Science 20/16, 10/15, 10/90
   e. Grade 4 (P.H.)Science March-May 1985 (Intervention was earlier introduction to unit than regular students) Score of 5 when pre-tested with regular education students. Scored higher than 1 regular education student.
   f. Grade 4 (K.A.) Science same intervention as above. Score of 6 Scored higher than 4 regular education students.

3. Comments regarding methods of communication with C-10
   a. Assignment folders (Due dates)
      1. J.K. seems to do better with homework folders- assignments have been completed.
      2. Good for students' use.
      3. Great idea!
      4. Has helped in getting work organized/done. Though still needs to work on completion dates.
      5. Adequate means.
   b. Teacher appointments
      1. Were called for as necessary or concerns discussed informally.
      2. Difficult to schedule at times.
      3. Satisfactory.
      4. None

   Also notes, memos, and personal contact.

4. Has student made improvements in other non-academic areas? (eg. self-esteem, study skills, peer relations, etc.) If so please describe.
   a. Yes- participates readily in classroom activities. Good work habits (tries to complete assignments)
   b. Definitely, he does pretty good with time on task. However, he becomes confused when directions are given in large group. He has often need of individual help.
   c. J.K. has been seeking more attention from the teachers by giving us letters she has written or talking to teachers after school.
   d. Occasionally able to take part in class science discussions causing surprise reaction from classmates.
   e. Both have shown improvement.
   f. Yes. J.Y. seems more confident about taking tests and speaking before class. She's even smiling more and playing with different peers now.
   g. J.A. was always open and friendly. She, too, seems to have gained more confidence in front of peers.
   h. Works hard and tries. Asks for help- seems to be doing more in other areas.
   i. Yes. Self-esteem. B.K. was always so pleased with himself when he did well on weekly quizes.

5. Would you like to see continued intervention next year if possible? If so what recommendations do you have for improvement in our present intervention procedure?
   a. Continue as with this year.
   b. Yes. Helps to have intervention to follow up completion of assignments as never finishes in class period.
   c. I would like S.K. to concentrate on the basics (reading, math, writing).
   d. Less classroom teacher involvement- more student responsibility for class assignments (upper grades).
   e. Yes, if text is followed for the basic skills.
   f. Yes! Would appreciate a brief outline of concepts being covered with child.
   g. Yes (3 times)

6. If we are able to intervene with only some of our students what do you feel our priority should be? (eg. those farthest behind grade level? 6th, 5th, 4th ...?)
   a. Those farthest behind grade level (1 teacher)
   b. 6th, 5th, 4th, ... (2 teachers)
   c. Those that need intervention the most no matter what grade level.
   d. I feel the child should be helped as early as possible. Why wait until there is so much more to catch up with?

7. What subject areas of intervention do you forsee us assisting you with in the future?
   a. Same subjects. You've been a great help!
   b. Written language skills.
   c. P.E., Science, Math
   d. Life survival skills.
   e. Social Studies
   f. Possibly in Social Studies or Science.

8. Will you be willing to allow us to observe our students functioning in your classroom in September?
   a. Yes (6 teachers)
   b. Perhaps the latter part of September.

9. Any additional comments or questions?
   a. I was very pleased with the help B.K. received. Your intervention allowed him to function near level of others and thereby prevented any kind of noticeable stigma or emotional isolation toward B.K.
   b. Nope!
   c. One problem in coordinating Special Education and regular students class work because of field trips etc.- the class focus may become concentrated in work other than that provided for the Special Education class. Regular class may lag behind the Special Education students.
   c. Communication between regular classroom teacher and Special Education teachers was better. I knew what was happening with my girls in C-10.

Lanaki Elementary

	Week of: MON.	TUES.	WED.	THUR.	FRI.	Week of: MON.	TUES.	WED.	THUR.	FRI.	Week of: MON.	TUES.	WED.	THUR.	FRI.	
Did you come in quietly? (1)																
Did you start working right away? (1)																
Did you work without bothering others? (1)																
Did you wait quietly for help from the teacher? (1)																
Did you do your work neatly and correctly? (2)																
Did you finish all your assignments? (4)																TOTAL
TOTAL:																

60

	Week of: MON.	TUES.	WED.	THUR.	FRI.	Week of: MON.	TUES.	WED.	THUR.	FRI.	Week of: MON.	TUES.	WED.	THUR.	FRI.	
Did you come in quietly? (1)																
Did you start working right away? (1)																
Did you work without bothering others? (1)																
Did you wait quietly for help from the teacher? (1)																
Did you do your work neatly and correctly? (2)																
Did you finish all your assignments? (4)																TOTAL
TOTAL:																

66

67

also from reg. T.

Lanakila Elementary

WEEK OF: _____

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY

WEEK OF: _____

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY

Lanakila
Elementary

4/9 Phonics p 87-89 SY
Math correction
127-201

5/1 Complete math
Corrections p 27,28

4/10 please remember to
bring homelunch
tomorrow.
math workbook 18,19 MY

4/11 No homework

4/15 No ~~homework~~,
review spelling SY

4/16 Phonics 90-92

4/17 *BRING HOME LUNCH
FOR FIELD TRIP
no homework!

4/22 No homework

4/23 ~~Secret motion option~~
Correct UTC(A) 15.16

69

4/24 No homework

4/25 Complete math p. 26
Correct p. 20,21,22,24

Appendix B-2

LIHOLIHO SCHOOL SPECIAL EDUCATION
INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM PROGRESS REPORT

Student _____

Dear Parents and Guardians,

Please review the progress that your child has made to date. Review your child's Individual Educational Program Progress Report for the Special Education Resource Room. After going over this report please sign and date the cover sheet. Then return this sheet with the entire report directly to the Resource Room. The report will be kept on file and made available for your viewing each quarter.

Your child's Individual Educational Program is good for a year. At the end of the year I will schedule an annual review Individual Educational Program conference with you.

Sincerely,

_____, Principal

Special Education Teacher

Parent's or Guardian's signature will acknowledge receipt of the Progress Report.

Teacher's Comments to the Parents:	Parent's Comments or questions to the Teacher:
_____Quarter	Parent's or Guardian's Signature _____ Date _____
_____Quarter	Parent's or Guardian's Signature _____ Date _____
_____Quarter	Parent's or Guardian's Signature _____ Date _____

SPECIAL EDUCATION
INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM GUIDE

IMPORTANT:

The following will be a guide to help you better understand the progress which your child is making in the GOALS and SHORT-TERM OBJECTIVES of his/her INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION (IEP).

CODE TO FOLLOW:

✓ = The skills that are checked (✓) are the skills we plan to work on during the year.

R = The skills with (R) in front will be reviewed during the year.

C = The skills with (C) in front will continue to develop during the year.

DATE = The date in the NO PROGRESS or PROGRESS column indicates that progress has been made on that skill to that date.

Date = The date in the MASTERED column indicates that your child has shown he/she has mastered that skill by meeting the criteria at this level and at this time.

64

Name: _____ . Liholiho Elementary WR-3,4

SHORT-TERM OBJECTIVES READING-WORD RECOGNITION	Method of Evaluation	Evaluation No Prog.	Prog.	Mastered	Comments
With 80% accuracy on level _____ material, the student will be able to:	Curriculum based assessment. Teacher observation or work.				
A. Context Use the meaning of the sentence or paragraph with initial consonant to predict unknown words.					
B. Sight Words Recognize 41 Level 3 Dolch Basic Sight Words.					
C. Phonetic Analysis Associate letters with sounds for:					
1. Consonant Blends Cluster of 2 consonants- eg. gl, br, st.					
Cluster of 3 consonants- eg. str, spl.					
2. Consonants hard and soft g					65
q (qu)					
3. Consonant Digraphs ph gh					
4. Silent Consonants wr, kn, tch					
5. Short Vowels a e i o u					
6. Long Vowels-Vowel-consonant-silent e pattern a e i o u					
7. Y as Vowel e sound at end of 2 syllable word					

Name:_____ _____ Yr._____ Liholiho Elementary M-3,4A+S

SHORT-TERM OBJECTIVES MATH	Method of Evaluation	Evaluation No Prog.	Prog.	Evaluation	Comments
With 80% accuracy on level _____ material, the student will be able to:	Direct teacher observation of work. Curriculum based assessment.				
A. Addition					
1. Add basic facts to sum 18.					
2. Add a 1 or 2 digit number to a 2 digit number.					
3. Add a 1, 2, or 3 digit number to a 3 digit number.					
4. Add a 1, 2, 3, or 4 digit number to a 4 digit number.					
5. Add whole numbers up to 5 digits.					
6. Add money.					
B. Subtraction					
1. Subtract basic facts from 18 and less.					99
2. Subtract 2 and 3 digit numbers without regrouping.					
3. Subtract 2 and 3 digit numbers with regrouping.					
4. Subtract 2 and 3 digit numbers with regrouping hundreds.					
5. Subtract 2 and 3 digit numbers with regrouping twice.					
6. Subtract 4 digit numbers.					
7. Subtract using money notation.					
8. Subtract 5 digit numbers regrouping once or more.					

Name: _____ Yr. ____ Liholiho Elementary W-4

SHORT-TERM OBJECTIVES

WRITING - CURSIVE

	Method of Evaluation	Evaluation			Comments
		No Prog.	Prog.	Mastered	
IV. With 80% acceptable responses the student will be able to:	Writing samples will be periodically evaluated.				
A. Write simple paragraph with model.					
B. Write simple paragraph without model.					
C. Write simple paragraphs with model.					
D. Write simple paragraphs without model.					
E. Write simple personal letter.					
F. Write full address (own).					
G. Write letter with appropriate greeting, closing, and placement.					
H. Address envelope.					
I. Write simple telephone message.					
J. Write simple directions.					
K. Write using capitalization appropriately.					
L. Write using punctuation appropriately period, comma, question mark					
M. Write simple report.					

SHORT-TERM OBJECTIVES WORK HABITS	Method of Evaluation	Evaluation No Prog.	Prog.	Mastered	Comments
With 80% acceptable responses in the Resource Room, the student will be able to:	Direct teacher observation of performance.				
A. Make good use of time in performing daily routines and beginning tasks if reminded.					
B. Make good use of time in performing daily routines and beginning tasks independently.	Periodic teacher evaluation of performance.				
C. Work in an organized and orderly manner.					
D. Make use of different sources of information.					
E. Weigh evidence carefully before drawing conclusions.					
F. Complete class assignments with:					
1. Continual attention and reinforcement from teacher.					
2. Some attention and reinforcement from teacher.					
3. Independently.					
G. Complete homework assignments with parent signing off:					
1. Sometimes					
2. Half of the time					
3. Almost always					
H. Volunteers for tasks					
1. Sometimes					
2. Often					

Name: _____ r.____ Liholiho Elementary T-C1

SHORT TERM OBJECTIVES THINKING-COMPREHENSION SKILLS	Method of Evaluation	Evaluation No Prog.	Prog.	Mastered	Comments
I. With 80% accuracy on level____ material, the student will be able to do: A. Literal Comprehension (Thinking as perceiving, remembering, retrieving) 1. Details - Recognize or recall details who, what, when, where, why.	1. Periodic evaluation of Teacher directed questioning and student's responses.				
2. Retell paragraph or story.	2. Curriculum based assessment.				
3. Main Ideas - Identify a sentence, phrase or word that states the main idea.					
4. Sequence - Recognize or recall the order of events, listing, time sequence.					
5. Compare - Contrast - Identify the similarities and differences in given data.					
6. Cause - Effect - Recognize the casual relationship in given data.					

Liholiho Elementary

STUDENT'S EVALUATION OF HIS/HER PROGRESS

Name _____

Date _____

1st Quarter Evaluation

I have been STUDENT OF THE WEEK _____ times.
I did well on my spelling tests _____.
I did my homework each night and turned it in signed _____.
I did good work and good thinking in class _____.
I behaved well in school _____.

I did my best work in _____.
Something I learned _____.
Something I enjoyed _____.
I need to work harder on _____.
How I feel about myself now _____.

Student: _____ Parent: _____

2nd QUARTER EVALUATION

I have been STUDENT OF THE WEEK _____times.
I did well on my spelling tests _____.
I did my homework each night and turned it in signed _____.
I behaved well in school _____.

I did my best work in _____.
Something I learned _____.
Something I enjoyed _____.
I need to work harder on _____.
How I feel about myself now _____.

Student: _____ Parent: _____

3rd QUARTER EVALUATION

I have been STUDENT OF THE WEEK _____times.
I did well on my spelling tests _____.
I did my homework each night and turned it in signed _____.
I behaved well in school _____.

I did my best work in _____.
Something I learned _____.
Something I enjoyed _____.
I need to work harder on _____.
How I feel about myself now _____.

Student: _____ Parent: _____

4th QUARTER EVALUATION

I have been STUDENT OF THE WEEK _____times.
I did well on my spelling tests _____.
I did my homework each night and turned it in signed _____.
I behaved well in school _____.

I did my best work in _____.
Something I learned _____.
Something I enjoyed _____.
I need to work harder on _____.
How I feel about myself now _____.

Student: _____ Parent: _____

Liholiho Elementary

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1. Have your STUDYBOOK in school. 2. SPELLING Do Spelling homework. 3. _____ _____	1. READING Read aloud to someone. Talk about what you read. 2. _____ _____ 3.	1. MATH _____ _____ 2. _____ _____	1. SPELLING Study for test. 2. READING Read library book for 15 minutes. 3. LIBRARY Return book:	HOW WELL DID YOU DO THIS WEEK? 1. Spelling test score: 2. Homework responsibilities: 3. Working in school:
Parent Check:	Parent Check:	Parent Check:	Parent Check:	Parent Check:

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1. Have your STUDYBOOK in school. 2. SPELLING Do Spelling homework. 3. _____ _____	1. READING Read aloud to someone. Talk about what you read. 2. _____ _____ 3.	1. MATH _____ _____ 2. _____ _____	1. SPELLING Study for test. 2. READING Read library book for 15 minutes. 3. LIBRARY Return book:	HOW WELL DID YOU DO THIS WEEK? 1. Spelling test score: 2. Homework responsibilities: 3. Working in school:
Parent Check:	Parent Check:	Parent Check:	Parent Check:	Parent Check:

Lunali... Elementary

INDIVIDUALIZED E JCATION PROGRAM - PROGRESS REPORT

Name _____ Subject Area/Related Service _____

Date of IEP: Starting Date:

Person(s) Responsible

_____

Completion Date:

_____

NP - NO PROGRESS
P - PROGRESSING
M - MASTERED

Annual Goal Number ____	Short Term Objective(s)	Method of Evaluation				Evaluation				Comments
		WDCK	WRAT	OTHER	KYMTI	1st	2nd QUAR	3rd TERS	4th	

72

88

89

LUNALILO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

73

SPECIAL EDUCATION
STUDENT PROGRESS REPORT

STUDENT _____ SCHOOL YEAR _____

[redacted] TEACHER Mrs. L. Kinoshita

	1	2	3	4	COMMENTS
READING					
Reader Level					
Word Attack Skills					
Sight Word Recognition					
Oral Reading					
LANGUAGE					
Expresses self effectively					
Understands spoken language					
Speech - Good articulation and grammar					
WRITING					
Expresses ideas clearly					
Writes legibly and neatly					
Uses correct letter formation					
SPELLING					
Speller level					
Progress in Spelling					
Application to daily work					
MATHEMATICS					
Math Level					
Knows Basic Number Facts					
Understands Basic Operations (+, -, x, ÷)					
Able to solve Word Problems					
PERCEPTUAL					
Auditory Perceptual					
Visual Perceptual					
Fine Motor Coordination					
LISTENING					
Understands Oral Directions					
Follows 1, 2, 3, 4 step directions					
PERSONAL - SOCIAL					
Positive self-concept					
Follows classroom rules					
Pays attention					
Follows directions appropriately					
Participate in group activities					
Takes care of personal/school materials					
Tolerates failure appropriately & persists on task					
WORK HABITS					
Strives for neatness and accuracy					
Makes appropriate use of time in class					
Able to work independently					
Completes daily work assignments					
Completes and turns in Homework when given					
Makes necessary corrections in all work					

LUNALILO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

SPECIAL EDUCATION
STUDENT PROGRESS REPORT

74

EXPLANATION OF MARKS:

S+	GOOD PROGRESS
S	SATISFACTORY PROGRESS
S-	LESS THAN SATISFACTORY PROGRESS
U	UNSATISFACTORY, NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
/	NO GRADE DUE TO INSUFFICIENT DATA AND/OR AREA NOT WORKED ON

PARENTS:

PLEASE SIGN AND RETURN TO ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS PROGRESS REPORT.

FIRST QUARTER:

PARENT'S SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

SECOND QUARTER:

PARENT'S SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

THIRD QUARTER:

PARENT'S SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

FOURTH QUARTER:

PARENT'S SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

JOB CHART 75'
LUNALILO EL. SCHOOL

RM. B-10
GR.:____
QTR.:____

NAME:_____

WEEK OF:	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
PHONICS LEVEL:___					
RDG./LANG. GR.:___					
SPELLING LEVEL:___					
WRITING:					
COMPREHENSION:					
LISTENING:					
PERCEPTUAL:					
MATH GR. LEVEL:					
********** BEHAVIORAL SHEET **********					
1 I came on time & settled down rt. away.					
5 I finished all my work assignments on time.					
1 I behaved very well & followed rules.					
2 Paid attention & listened carefully					
1 I finished my corrections or make-up work					
2 I completed my HW & returned it w/ HW folder.					
COMMENTS:					
TOTAL POINTS:					

0 - 7 pts. = TRY HARDER NEXT TIME.!

JOB CHART
LUNALILO EL. SCHOOL

RM. B-10
GR.:____
QTR.:____

NAME:_____

WEEK OF:	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
PHONICS LEVEL:___					
RDG./LANG. GR.____					
SPELLING LEVEL:___					
WRITING:					
COMPREHENSION:					
LISTENING:					
PERCEPTUAL:					
MATH GR. LEVEL:					
********** BEHAVIORAL SHEET **********					
I came on time & settled down rt. away.					
I finished all my work assignments on time.					
I behaved very well & followed rules.					
Paid attention & listened carefully					
I finished my corrections or make-up work					
I completed my HW & returned it w/ my HW folder.					
COMMENTS:					
TOTAL POINTS:					

0 - 7 pts - TRY HARDER NEXT TIME!!

SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASS 77

LUNALILO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

RM. B - 10

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM CHECK LIST

IEP DATE:_____

IEP ANNIV:_____

AREAS RECOMMENDED (FORM A)	MATERIALS BEING USED